



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,839	03/31/2004	Hugh B. Svendsen	1104-062	6056
27820 7590 08/23/2007 WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C. 100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE SUITE 160 CARY, NC 27518			EXAMINER KIM, JUNG W	
			ART UNIT 2132	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/813,839

Applicant(s)

SVENDSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jung Kim

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 15-25 and 31-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 and 26-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-34 are pending.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 2, last paragraph, filed 2/12/07, with respect to the prior art rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-34 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sit et al. USPN 6,349,336.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 2 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: replace "(iv) sending the response packet to peer server to the proxy server" with --(iv) sending the response packet from the peer server to the proxy server--. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2132

5. Claims 1-4 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit et al. USPN 6,349,336 (hereinafter Sit).

6. As per claims 1-4, Sit discloses a method for providing a Web browser running on a computer with HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall in a peer-to-peer network (col. 8:14-21), comprising; (a) providing the peer-to-peer network with a proxy server (fig. 5); (b) registering an outbound socket connection with the proxy server by the peer server (5:16-20); (c) in response to the proxy server receiving an HTTP request to access the peer server from the Web browser, translating the HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server (7:50-60); and (d) in response to the peer server receiving the request packet, translating the request packet back into the HTTP request and responding to the request, thereby enabling generic web traffic to flow (7:61-64);

7. wherein the peer server further includes a Web server (fig. 5, reference nos. 308E and 308I), step (d) further including the steps of: (i) responding to request by passing the HTTP request to the Web server; (ii) receiving an HTTP response from Web server; (iii) translating HTTP response into a response packet; (iv) sending the response packet from the peer server to the proxy server over the outbound socket connection; (v) receiving the response packet on the proxy server and translating a response packet back into the HTTP response; and (vi) sending the HTTP response from the peer server to the Web browser; (7:64-68)

8. wherein the peer-to-peer network includes multiple peer servers, and the proxy server is separate and apart from the peer servers;(fig. 5, reference nos. 306 and 312)
9. providing each of the peer servers with a peer node, a Web server, and a Web browser. (fig. 5, reference nos. 308E, 310E, 314E, 308I, 310I and 314I)
10. As per claims 17-20, they are claims corresponding to claims 1-4, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 17-20 are rejected as being anticipated by Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 5-7, 15, 16, 21-23 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit.

13. As per claims 5-7, the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not expressly disclose providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of

Art Unit: 2132

the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. However, these steps are conventional means of resolving domain names. DNS registration is the defacto means of mapping hostnames to IP addresses. Further, because a peer server is located behind the proxy server, the peer server needs to register with the DNS with information that it is assigned to the proxy server. Moreover, resolution of domain names requires the name of the proxy server and the IP address of the server. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the invention of Sit to further include the following steps: providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server and a DNS server; passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server. One would be motivated to do so to enable a user to access a peer server behind a proxy agent using a host name. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 5-7.

14. As per claims 21-23, they are claims corresponding to claims 5-7, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 5-7. Therefore, claims 21-

Art Unit: 2132

23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 5-7.

15. As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose step (d) further includes the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets, it is notoriously well known in the art that data over a link is transmitted in limited size blocks of data to enable reliable and efficient transmission of the message. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for step (d) to further include the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets. One would be motivated to do so to transmit messages reliably and efficiently as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 15.

16. As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Although Sit does not expressly disclose wherein the step (d) further includes the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server; conventional servers are typically enabled to handle multiple requests simultaneously to prevent.

Art Unit: 2132

bottlenecks caused by a single request. Furthermore, threading is achieved via multiprocessing. Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of (d) to further include the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server. One would be motivated to do so to provide an efficient means of handling requests via multiprocessing as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 16.

17. As per claims 31 and 32, they are claims corresponding to claims 15 and 16, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 15 and 16.

Therefore, claims 31 and 32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

18. As per claims 33 and 34, the limitations of these claims are covered by the invention disclosed by Sit and the obvious enhancements as discussed in the prior art rejections of claims 1-7, 15 and 16. Therefore, claims 33 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-7, 15 and 16.



Art Unit: 2132

19. Claims 8, 9, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta et al. USPN 6,917,965 (hereinafter Gupta).

20. As per claims 8 and 9, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sit is incorporated herein. Sit does not disclose the step (b) further includes the step of: after the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via e-mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request. Gupta discloses means for presenting multimedia to users and presenting annotations to the multimedia, whereby users are notified by email of new annotations, whereby the emails notifying users of new annotations include a URL of the media content. Col. 15:66-16:6. Such a feature provides a useful tool to notify users of new content. Col. 2:5-21. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the method of Sit to further include the step of: after the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via e-mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail; wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request (DNS is contacted to resolve the URL to an IP address). One would be motivated to do so to provide a useful

Art Unit: 2132

tool to notify users of new content as taught by Gupta, *ibid.* The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 8 and 9.

21. As per claims 24 and 25, they are claims corresponding to claims 8 and 9, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 8 and 9. Therefore, claims 24 and 25 are rejected as being unpatentable over Sit in view of Gupta for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 8 and 9.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

22. Claims 10-14 and 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Communications Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung W. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jung W Kim  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2132